



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/640,168	08/15/2000	Hugh J. McLarty	09623-027700US	5174

20350 7590 10/24/2002

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2002

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/640,168

Applicant(s)

MACLARTY ET AL

Examiner

Srilakshmi K. Kumar

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The following office action is in response to Amendment A, filed July 8, 2002. Claims 1-18 are pending with claims 1 and 18 being amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (US 6,191,758).

As to independent claim 1, Lee discloses a host computer (fig. 1, item 14), a first monitor connected to said host computer (10), a second monitor (12) separate and unattached to said first monitor and smaller than said first monitor (12), a video driver (Fig. 5, item 516) in said host computer for providing a portion of a display on said first monitor to said second monitor (col. 1, line 64-col 2, line 13, col.).

Art Unit: 2675

As to independent claim 18, limitations of claim 1, above and further comprising, wherein said second monitor includes, a display screen (12), a display controller (Fig. 2, items 216, 218 and Fig. 5, item 516) coupled to said display screen, a video memory (Fig. 2, items 206, 208) coupled to said display controller, a bus interfaced coupled to said video memory (Fig. 2, bus) (col. 4, line 54-col. 5, line 23).

As to dependent claim 2, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, a shared peripheral bus connected between said host computer and said second monitor (Fig. 2, item bus).

As to dependent claim 3, limitations of claim 2, and further comprising, wherein said second monitor is powered by said shared peripheral bus (fig. 2, item bus, col. 4, line 54-col. 5, line 23).

As to dependent claim 4, limitations of claim 2, and further comprising, wherein said shared peripheral is a universal serial bus. Lee states only a bus in col. 4, line 54-col. 5, line 23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the bus could have been a universal serial bus.

As to claim 5, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising wherein said portion of a display comprises a separate window from said first monitor (

As to claim 6, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising wherein said portion of a display is provided only to said second monitor (col. 5, line 40-col. 6, line 3).

As to claim 8, limitations claim 1, and further comprising, a software operating system controlling said first computer, said operating system controlling the transmission of video data to said second monitor (col. 5, lines 30-56).

As to claim 9, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, wherein said second monitor includes, a display screen (12), a display controller (Fig. 2, item 218) coupled to said display screen (12), a video memory (206 & 208) coupled to said display controller, a bus interfaced coupled to said video memory (bus).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,191,758).

As to claim 10, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising wherein display screen on said second monitor is less than 8.5 inches diagonally. Lee shows in Fig 1, where the second monitor display is considerably smaller than the first. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the second display screen could have easily been smaller than 8.5 inches diagonally.

5. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Grossman et al. (US 5,682,486).

As to claim 11, limitations of claim 1, wherein second monitor includes a touch screen. Lee does not disclose where the second monitor is a touch screen, Grossman et al disclose a monitor system comprising a plurality of monitors connected to the same host computer where the auxiliary monitor (Fig. 1, item 150) is an LCD display (col. 2, lines 54-55). It would have

Art Unit: 2675

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that certain displays could have been liquid crystal displays which can be touch screens. Touch screens are advantageous as they provide the user with a user input type of device as well as a display. The system of Lee is combinable with that of Grossman et al as they both disclose monitor systems comprising a plurality of monitors connected to the same host computer.

As to claims 12 and 13, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising wherein said second monitor includes icon for control of a display on said first monitor. In col. 3, lines 20-35, Grossman et al disclose where the icons or windows or animated images maybe transmitted to the second monitor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that these features shown by Grossman et al could have been incorporated into that of Lee as both systems disclose a monitor system comprising a plurality of monitors connected to the same host computer and the transmission of video data to the second monitor is advantageous as it allows the user to have selectable icons without cluttering the first monitor.

As to claim 14, limitations of claim 13 and further comprising wherein said transmission capability is wireless. Though neither Lee nor Grossman et al disclose a wireless transmission, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that wireless transmissions are incorporable into both systems as wireless systems such as a personal digital assistants are a commonplace as they allow users extensive mobility.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Craig (US 5,790,176).

As to dependent claim 7, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, a compression unit in said host computer for compressing said portion of said display for transmission to said

Art Unit: 2675

second monitor; Lee and Grossman et al fail to disclose a compression unit. Craig discloses an MPEG encoder as shown in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an MPEG encoder into that of Lee and Grossman et al as Craig is transmitting video over a network, similar to that of Grossman et al. The MPEG encoder for video is advantageous as it provides compressed video, which can in turn be transmitted at higher speeds.

7. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Grossman et al, and further in view Craig (US 5,790,176).

As to independent claim 15, limitations of claim 1, and further comprising, a display screen on said second monitor of less than 8.5 inches diagonally; Lee shows in Fig 1, where the second monitor display is considerably smaller than the first. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the second display screen could have easily been smaller than 8.5 inches diagonally.

a display controller coupled to said display screen (16), a video memory (36) coupled to said display controller, a bus interfaced coupled to said video memory (14), second monitor is powered by said shared peripheral bus (fig. 1, item 14, col. 6, lines 19-30)

a compression unit in said host computer for compressing said portion of said display for transmission to said second monitor; Lee and Grossman et al fail to disclose a compression unit. Craig discloses an MPEG encoder as shown in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an MPEG encoder into that of Lee and Grossman et al as Craig is transmitting video over a network, similar to that of Grossman et al. The MPEG

Art Unit: 2675

encoder for video is advantageous as it provides compressed video, which can in turn be transmitted at higher speeds.

As to claim 16, see claim 4, above.

As to claim 17, see claim 8, above.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Please refer to the new rejection above.

Conclusion

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label

“PROPOSED” or DRAFT”)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal drive,

Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srilakshmi K. Kumar whose telephone number is 703 306 5575.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm alternate Fridays off.

Art Unit: 2675

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven J. Saras can be reached on 703 305 9720. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 306-0377 for regular communications and 703 308 9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 4700.

Srilakshmi K. Kumar
Examiner
Art Unit 2675

SKK
October 20, 2002



STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600